

RECEIVED

AUG 18 2016

CITY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW

CITY CLERK

ARGUMENT

Declaration by Author(s) or Proponent(s)

(Elections Code §9600)

"The undersigned author(s) of the:

- ☐ argument in favor of
☐ argument against
☒ rebuttal to the argument in favor of
☐ rebuttal to the argument against

Ballot measure W (letter to be assigned by the Santa Clara County Registrar of Voters on August 12th) at the Consolidated Municipal Election for the City of Mountain View to be held on November 8, 2016, hereby state that such argument is true and correct to the best of his knowledge and belief.
(his/her/their)

ARGUMENT/REBUTTAL FILED BY (check any of the following that apply):

☐ **City Council**
Contact Person's **TYPED** Name: _____
Contact Person's Signature: _____
Title: _____
Phone: _____ Fax: _____
E-Mail: _____

☐ **Bona Fide Association of Citizens or Filers**
Name of Association: _____
Principal Officer's **TYPED** Name: _____
Principal Officer's Signature: _____
Title: _____
Phone: _____ Fax: _____
E-Mail: _____

☒ **Individual voter who is eligible to vote on the measure**
TYPED Name: Gary Wesley
Signature of Voter: [Signature]
Address Where You Live: 707 Continental Circle 424, Mountain View CA 94040
Phone: 408-882-5070 Fax: _____
E-Mail: gary.wesley@yahoo.com

RECEIVED

AUG 18 2016


CITY CLERK

SIGNATURE STATEMENT - PAGE 2

CHECK ONE OF THE FOLLOWING & NOTE THAT THE LETTER OF MEASURE WILL BE ASSIGNED BY THE SANTA CLARA COUNTY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS ON AUGUST 12th:

- ☐ Argument in Favor of Measure _____
☐ Argument Against Measure _____
☒ Rebuttal to Argument in Favor of Measure W
☐ Rebuttal to Argument Against Measure _____

The signatures of the following persons below will be printed **as submitted** following the argument or rebuttal.

SIGNATURE	TYPE NAME as it will appear in the Voter's Information Pamphlet	TYPE TITLE & NAME OF ASSOCIATION (IF APPLICABLE) as it will appear in the Voter's Information Pamphlet	ARE YOU SIGNING ON BEHALF OF AN ASSOCIATION? Yes or <u>No</u> If no, and you are signing as an individual voter, please provide address of where you live.	DATE
1. 	Gary Wesley Female <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/>	Long-term Resident Attorney		8-16-16
2.	Female <input type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/>			
3.	Female <input type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/>			
4.	Female <input type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/>			
5.	Female <input type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/>			

Under state law (*California Civil Code Section 1954.50, et seq.*), a residential landlord generally may charge a new tenant whatever (initial) rent the market will bear. In the context of local rent control, this state mandate is sometimes called “*vacancy decontrol*.”

The state law assures landlords the opportunity to increase their overall rental income greatly as vacancies occur - even when there is local rent control. At the same time, “*vacancy decontrol*” provides landlords (in rent control cities) with the incentive to end existing tenancies and get new tenants at market rates.

A local rent control law that does NOT outlaw simply ending tenancies instead of raising rents will NOT help tenants..

The 4 landlord-endorsed City Councilmembers who placed this competing measure on the ballot (McAlister, Clark, Showalter and Kasperzak) first agreed that affected tenants should only be evicted for “*just cause*” but then created a ***GIANT LOOPHOLE*** in the law they are proposing.

Under Measure W, landlords could end tenancies without any *just cause* as long as those tenants are given some “*relocation expenses*” - the amount of which may be re-set by vote of the (mostly landlord-endorsed) City Council!

RECEIVED

AUG 18 2016

CITY CLERK